

Cyclical Redrafting and Controlled Testing

Cyclical redrafting and controlled testing are the methods by which Malone Doctrine is refined before and after adoption. They recognize that doctrinal language may appear correct in isolation yet fail when compared with other provisions, applied to difficult cases, interpreted by hostile actors, or translated into institutional practice.

The objective is not endless revision. It is disciplined reliability.

A doctrinal provision should move through repeated cycles of drafting, application, criticism, reconciliation, and correction until its language, authority, scope, and practical consequences are sufficiently clear.

The working cycle is:

Draft → Compare → Test → Identify Defect → Revise → Retest → Reconcile → Adopt

After adoption, implementation may produce new evidence that begins another controlled cycle.

Why Redrafting Must Be Cyclical

Doctrinal drafting rarely develops correctly in one direction.

A proposed article may reveal the need for a principle. The principle may expose a weakness in an existing axiom. A newly written rule may conflict with another rule or prove impossible to execute. A procedure may reveal that the governing standard is too vague. Commentary may uncover several plausible interpretations of language that initially appeared precise.

Each discovery may require changes above, below, or beside the provision being reviewed.

Redrafting is therefore cyclical because the Doctrine is an interconnected system. A change at one level may affect several others.

For example:

- revising an axiom may require multiple principles to be reconsidered;
- narrowing a principle may invalidate a broader rule;
- changing a rule may require new procedures and training;
- testing a procedure may reveal a missing exception;
- an implementation failure may expose a mistaken diagnosis of the original problem.

A provision is not complete merely because its own wording is polished. It must function within the full doctrinal architecture.

Controlled Testing

Controlled testing is the deliberate application of proposed doctrine to selected cases before treating the provision as settled authority.

Testing should not depend solely upon the case that inspired the rule. A provision written for one sympathetic situation may produce unjust or impractical results when applied elsewhere.

A proposed provision should be tested against:

- the original problem;
- an ordinary application;
- an unusual or difficult case;
- a case involving a person the drafter does not favor;
- an institutional application;
- a conflict between individual and collective interests;
- foreseeable misuse by an incompetent or hostile official;
- resource limitations;
- emergency conditions;
- long-term succession.

This testing determines whether the language remains valid when circumstances change.

The controlling question is:

Would this provision still be just, coherent, and useful if applied by another leader, to another institution, or against a person with whom the drafter disagrees?

If not, the provision may be too personal, partisan, broad, vague, or dependent upon benevolent interpretation.

Testing Across the Authority Hierarchy

Each level of Malone Doctrine requires a different form of testing.

An **axiom** must be tested for universality, foundational necessity, and consistency with the nature and jurisdiction of the Doctrine.

A **principle** must be tested across varied cases to determine whether it establishes a durable ethical standard without becoming empty or absolute beyond reason.

A **maxim** must be tested for memorability, practical usefulness, and the possibility that its compressed language could mislead when separated from higher authority.

A **rule** must be tested for clarity, enforceability, jurisdiction, exceptions, unintended consequences, and susceptibility to selective application.

A **procedure** must be tested through actual or simulated execution to determine whether responsibility, sequence, records, and decision points are workable.

Authorized commentary must be tested to ensure that it interprets rather than silently amends the governing provision.

Implementation documents must be tested against actual institutional capacity, cost, staffing, timing, and measurable outcomes.

A provision may succeed at one level and fail at another. A sound principle may support a poorly designed rule. A correct rule may be weakened by an impractical procedure.

Testing must therefore examine both the individual provision and the full vertical chain.

Conflict Testing

New doctrine must be compared with existing authority.

Conflict testing asks:

- Does the provision contradict an existing axiom or principle?
- Does it impose duties that cannot be performed together?
- Does it create a broad exception that defeats another rule?
- Does it confuse institutional jurisdiction?
- Does it weaken due process, truth, responsibility, justice, or stewardship?
- Can the provisions be harmonized through interpretation?
- Must one provision be amended, narrowed, or superseded?

Where genuine conflict remains, the higher-ranking provision controls. The existence of this rule does not eliminate the need to revise the lower provision. A system that repeatedly relies upon conflict rules instead of correcting defective language becomes difficult to administer.

Conflict testing should produce reconciliation, not merely a winner.

Adversarial Testing

Doctrine should be examined from the perspective of a person attempting to misuse, evade, distort, or weaponize it.

Adversarial testing asks:

- How could this language be interpreted in bad faith?
- Could an official use it selectively?
- Could a leader expand personal authority beyond the intended limit?
- Could a member exploit an exception?
- Could an institution comply formally while defeating the actual purpose?

- Could vague language be used to punish dissent?
- Could procedural complexity become administrative attrition?

This form of testing is especially important for provisions involving discipline, exclusion, representation, evidence, emergency authority, and centralized power.

Doctrine should not depend entirely upon the goodwill of those applying it.

Operational Testing

A proposed solution must be capable of execution.

Operational testing converts the provision into a real or simulated workflow. It identifies who acts, what information is needed, what records are produced, how long the process takes, what resources are required, and what happens when something goes wrong.

A provision fails operational testing when:

- no responsible authority can be identified;
- the required evidence is unavailable;
- the process costs more than the problem justifies;
- deadlines are unrealistic;
- local institutions lack capacity;
- responsibilities overlap or disappear between offices;
- success cannot be measured;
- failure produces no corrective response.

Operational failure may require a new procedure, narrower rule, different institutional assignment, or revision of the proposed solution itself.

Provisional Use

Some provisions may require limited application before full adoption.

Provisional use should be clearly identified as experimental rather than binding precedent. It should define:

- the problem being tested;
- participating institution or unit;
- temporary authority;
- beginning and ending dates;
- required records;
- measures of success;
- conditions for suspension;
- review authority;
- effect upon later adoption.

A pilot program should not quietly become permanent merely because no one conducted the required review.

Controlled testing requires a defined conclusion.

Redrafting Discipline

Each revision should respond to an identified defect.

A redraft may be necessary because the provision is:

- ambiguous;
- overbroad;
- too narrow;
- internally contradictory;
- inconsistent with higher authority;
- difficult to implement;
- vulnerable to abuse;
- based upon an incomplete factual diagnosis;
- unsupported by adequate jurisdiction;
- incapable of producing the intended result.

Changes should not be made merely to create the appearance of progress or satisfy temporary political pressure.

The revision record should explain:

- what language changed;
- what defect was identified;
- what evidence or test revealed it;
- why the new language is preferable;
- what related provisions were reviewed;
- whether implementation documents must also change.

This creates accountable development rather than silent doctrinal drift.

The Point of Stability

Cyclical redrafting must eventually produce a stable provision.

A draft is ready for adoption when:

- its problem and purpose are clear;
- its authority level is correct;
- its language is sufficiently precise;
- its relationship to higher and neighboring provisions is coherent;
- foreseeable exceptions are addressed;

- adversarial and operational testing do not reveal material defects;
- responsible institutions can implement it;
- success and failure can be evaluated;
- revision history and adoption status can be preserved.

Perfection is not required. Sufficient reliability is.

Once adopted, the provision governs until lawfully revised. Continued disagreement alone does not suspend its authority.

Post-Adoption Testing

Implementation is the strongest test of doctrine.

After adoption, institutions should examine whether the provision:

- is understood consistently;
- changes conduct;
- corrects the intended problem;
- produces avoidable burdens;
- creates incentives for evasion;
- works across locations and institutions;
- remains aligned with the Doctrine's higher purposes.

Post-adoption review does not make the provision optional. It produces the evidence required for controlled revision.

Where urgent harm appears, authorized interim measures may be necessary. Otherwise, amendment should proceed through established version control and adoption procedures.

Governing Principle

The governing principle is:

No material doctrinal provision should be treated as complete until it has been repeatedly compared, tested, reconciled, and revised against realistic applications and the existing hierarchy of authority.

The corresponding restraint is:

Testing and revision shall improve doctrinal reliability without allowing perpetual drafting, informal amendment, or temporary disagreement to defeat adopted authority.

Cyclical redrafting allows Malone Doctrine to learn. Controlled testing prevents that learning process from becoming arbitrary. Together, they produce authority that is deliberate rather than impulsive, adaptable rather than unstable, and strong enough to survive both practical failure and hostile interpretation.